



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/692,668	10/20/2000	Takao Mukai	36856.366	7526

7590 12/18/2002
Keating & Bennett LLP
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312
Fairfax, VA 22030

EXAMINER

GONZALEZ, JULIO C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2834

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2002

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/692,668

Applicant(s)

MUKAI ET AL.

Examiner

Julio C. Gonzalez

Art Unit

2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,5,7,9,10,13,14,16 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,5,7,9,10,13,14,16 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 15.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10, 13, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ago et al in view of Takakuwa (JP 08-195644).

Ago et al discloses a surface acoustic wave device comprising a piezoelectric substrate 5 having a pair of edges, an interdigital transducer 4 provided on main region wherein a distance L is between at least one inner edge and corresponding one of the substrate edges is about $\lambda/10$ to about 8λ (see figures 2, 4, 5). Also, the step depth is in the range of about 2λ to about 6λ (column 5, lines 47-49). Moreover the IDT has a plurality of electrode fingers (see figure 2 and column 2, lines 7-11).

However, Ago et al does not disclose having two IDT's.

On the other hand, Takakuwa discloses for the purpose of providing an end surface reflection type surface wave device, which hardly causes damping, a piezoelectric device (see figure 9) having two IDT's 42 and 43.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design a surface acoustic wave as disclosed by Ago et al and to modify the invention by having two IDT's for the purpose of providing a end surface reflection type surface wave device, which hardly causes damping by Takakuwa.

3. Claim 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ago et al and Takakuwa as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of Kadota et al.

The combined surface acoustic wave discloses all of the elements above. However the combined surface acoustic does not disclose that the fingers have different wavelengths.

On the other hand, Kadota et al discloses for the purpose of reducing the manufacturing cost of surface wave resonators, outermost electrode fingers with a wavelength of about $\lambda/8$ and the other electrode fingers of about $\lambda/4$ (column 3, lines 42-48).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the combined surface acoustic wave as disclosed above and to modify the invention by using different wavelengths for the electrode

fingers for the purpose of reducing the manufacturing cost of surface wave resonators as disclosed by Kadota et al.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16 and 18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. Action was made final since the Takakuwa (JP 08-195644) reference was provided on an IDS filed on 04/30/02 (see MPEP 706.07(a)).

Conclusion

Applicant's submission of an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) on 04/30/02 prompted the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 609(B)(2)(i). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action.


In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the

THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Julio C. Gonzalez whose telephone number is (703) 305-1563. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8AM-5PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on (703) 308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 305-1341 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.


NESTOR RAMIREZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Jcg

December 12, 2002